

REMARKS

In the above-referenced Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-4, 8-14, 18-20, 31-34, 38-44, 48-50, 61-64, 68-74, 78-80 and 91-105 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Olich (U.S. 5,298,904). Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the above rejections.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Claims (as recited in independent Claims 1, 31, 61 and 91 and included by dependence by all other Claims) recite several key features that are not taught in or suggested by Olich, as was pointed out by Applicants in the response to the previous Office Action filed on September 12, 2003.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner's Response to Arguments states that Applicants argued that the prior art does not show "detecting the phase of the returned carrier signals". In fact, Applicants argued that within the master unit of Olich, which is the apparatus that was being compared to the subject matter of the above-listed Claims, that there was no "phase detector for comparing the phase of each of the carriers of the second RF signal to the phase of each of the corresponding carriers of the third RF signal" as recited in the above-listed Claims.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner cites Figure 5 unit 311 and 323 as disclosing detecting the phase of the returned carrier signals. However, unit 311 and 323 are located within subsystem 23, which is the remote transceiver and not the master unit at all (subsystem 23 is located at the hole of Olich). Therefore, units 311 and 323 cannot measure the phase of the returned signal, as the returned signal is received at the master unit. In particular, the second RF signal recited in the above-listed Claims